DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 377 RC 004 098

AUTHOR LARSCN, WAYNE L.; SLCCUM, WALTER L.
TITLE THE IMPACT OF POVERTY ON RURAL YOUTH: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATICNSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY INCOME AND EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS, SELF-CONCEPT PERFORMANCE, AND VALUES OF RURAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.
INSTITUTION WASHINGTON STATE UNIV., PULLMAN. COLL. OF AGRICULTURE.
REPORT NO BULL-714
PUB DATE SEP 69
NOTE 14P.

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80
DESCRIPTORS ACADEMIC ASPIRATION, *ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES, *FAMILY INCCME, GUIDANCE, CCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION, *RURAL YOUTH, *SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS, SELF CCNCEPT, SOCICECONOMIC INFLUENCES, SURVEYS
IDENTIFIERS WASHINGTON

ABSTRACT

THE PURPCSE CF THIS STUDY OF RURAL YOUTH, INITIATED IN 1964, WAS TO DETERMINE IF LOW FAMILY INCCME TENDS TO DEPRESS STUDENTS' ASPIRATIONS, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND EXPECTATIONS. THE SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY CONSISTED OF 601 STUDENTS FROM 30 WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS. THE DATA WERE OBTAINED BY QUESTICNNAIRES AND INTERVIEWS ADMINISTERED TO STUDENTS, AND THRCUGH MAIL QUESTICNNAIRES TO THE PARENTS. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA REVEALED THAT STUDENTS FRCM LCW INCOME FAMILIES, WHEN CCMPARED TC STUDENTS FROM HIGH INCCME FAMILIES, WERE LESS LIKELY TO: (1) BE INTERESTED IN SCHOOL OR BE IN CURRICULA DESIGNED FOR COLLEGE-BCUND STUDENTS, (2) REPORT HIGH GRADES IN COURSE WORK, (3) RECEIVE ENCOURAGEMENT FROM TEACHERS TO ATTEND COLLEGE, (4) DISCUSS THEIR OCCUPATICNAL AND EDUCATICNAL PLANS WITH TEACHERS, (5) HOLD LEADERSHIP PCSITICNS IN SCHCCL ORGANIZATIONS, (6) INDICATE THAT THEY BELONG TO "LEADING CROWDS" IN THEIR SCHOOLS, (7) REPORT HIGH SCORES ON SELF EVALUATION SCALES INDICATING PHYSICAL, SOCIAL, ACADEMIC, AND EMOTICNAL SELF CONCEPTS, (8) REPORT HIGH LEVELS OF EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATICNAL ASPIRATICNS AND EXPECTATIONS, AND (9) REPORT THAT THEIR PARENTS CAN SUPPORT THEM FINANCIALLY IN SEVERAL EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PURSUITS. (TL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED036377

THE IMPACT OF POVERTY ON RURAL YOUTH

An analysis of the relationship between family income and educational aspirations self-concept performance and values of rural high-school students

WASHINGTON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION BULLETIN 714

RC004098

CONTENTS

Highlights 1

Implications 1

Introduction 2

Findings 4

References 12

Published by Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, Washington State University. September, 1969

THE IMPACT OF POVERTY ON RURAL YOUTH:

An analysis of the relationship between family income and educational aspirations, self-concept performance, and values of rural high school students

WAYNE L. LARSON AND WALTER L. SLOCUM[1]

HIGHLIGHTS

This study revealed that poverty and some of its "undesirable" effects are not confined to the ghetto or slum areas of our major urban centers; they are apparent in rural areas even in this relatively economically advantaged state.

Analysis of the relationships between the level of family income and selected indicators of self-concept, behavior and aspirations revealed that students from low income families are less likely than students from higher income families to:

1. be interested in school, and be in curriculums designed for students intending to enroll in college
2. report high grades in school course work
3. discuss their educational and occupational plans with teachers
4. receive encouragement from teachers to attend college
5. hold a relatively large number of leadership positions in school organizations; conversely they are more likely to hold *no* leadership positions
6. indicate that they belong to the "leading crowds" in their schools
7. report high scores on self evaluation scales indicating physical, social, academic and emotional self concepts
8. report high levels of educational and occupational aspirations
9. report high levels of educational and occupational expectations
10. indicate that their parents can support them financially in several educational and occupational pursuits.

We expected that the strength of the relationships between poverty and self concept, performance, aspirations, and expectations might vary by sex and residence of the students. Specifically, the expectation was a greater impact of poverty on girls when the students' report of income (perception of family income relative to other families in the community) rather than parents' report of actual dollar income was used as an indicator of poverty. The data most strongly support the relationship between educational variables and low income for nonfarm students and boys. Further analysis revealed that the strongest relationship existed for nonfarm boys on most indicators of aspirations, performance and expectations. Hence, the hypothesis that there would be a stronger impact of perceived low income on educational performance, aspirations, and expectations for girls was not supported. Two possible interpretations of the lack of confirmation are offered:

1. The data may reflect a true relationship, i.e., regardless of controlling conditions introduced, the relationship would be similar.
2. Cultural expectations with regard to educational and occupational aspirations and expectations vary by sex; girls are not expected to aspire to or achieve at the same levels as boys or higher with regard to educational and occupational goals. Hence, if we controlled for level of commitment to cultural double standards by sex, the relationship might have been different. Unfortunately, the survey instrument did not include a measure of commitment to traditional sex roles.

The study provided evidence that some boys and girls from low income families had become apathetic about school and their opportunities. However, many reported higher levels of self-appraisal and higher levels of educational performance, aspirations and expectations than would be expected from persons in poverty. On balance, we conclude that there is only partial support for the hypothesis that poverty leads to resignation from society and rejection of societal values and goals in the rural population of Washington. We remind the reader that the sample contained few, if any, representatives of racial or ethnic minorities and no students who lived in urban places (10,000 or over). Consequently, the foregoing observations about the impact of poverty should not be extrapolated without further research to minority groups nor to urban residents.

IMPLICATIONS

The fact that many boys and girls from low income families do have high educational aspirations and expectations and good grades as well as a high appraisal of their own abilities suggests the existence of:

1. an awareness that education is crucial for upward occupational mobility
2. a determination to realize individual potential through educational achievement.

This means that for a substantial proportion of rural high school students from low income families, the need is not

[1] Wayne L. Larson was a Research Assistant, and Walter L. Slocum is a Rural Sociologist, Rural Sociology Department, Washington State University. Work was conducted under project 1943.

the generation of aspirations but rather assistance in reaching goals already held. For many such students, financial assistance in attending college, or expanding community colleges and in effect bringing colleges closer to the poor, may very well be the most important form of help that society can provide.

For those who have resigned from society, the problem is both different and more difficult. We are not prepared at this time to suggest detailed remedial programs. There are enough apathetic students, however, to warrant more attention and resources than are now being devoted to solution of the complex problems involved.

INTRODUCTION

Although Washington ranked 12th in personal per capita income in 1965, and 11th in 1950 and 1960, it is not devoid of low income families even among those with white, employed family heads. Data from the 1960 census for Washington indicate that 10.4% of all white family heads who are employed had annual incomes below $4,000.[2] While 13.5% of rural-nonfarm families had incomes below $4,000, approximately 30% (30.3) of rural-farm families reported incomes of less than $4,000 from all sources. A major conclusion to be drawn from these data is that families who live in rural areas are more likely to have lower incomes than families who reside in rural-nonfarm or urban places. If we combine the information on family income with the finding from James S. Coleman's (1) study that rural schools tend to be "inferior in quality" when compared with urban schools, we can infer that rural students compete at a relative disadvantage in the educational process. With two notable exceptions (10, 13), the literature on the direct or indirect relationship of family income to educational aspirations, achievements, and expectations is rich with supportive inferences, but weak on supportive data. Paul Wallin and Leslie C. Waldo state in a monograph, "Published research on social class differences in school adjustment is conspicuous by its paucity." (13) Although we somewhat agree with this statement, we would qualify their assessment by suggesting that systematic quantitative treatment of the relationship between social class and school adjustment was conspicuous by its absence. In spite of this situation, there does seem to be consensus that a direct relationship exists, or would exist, between socio-economic status and school adjustment and, ultimately, one's life chances.

The explanation of this relationship usually takes one of the following forms. The family in the lower social class or low-income family does not provide:

1. the necessary motivation in the form of expressed values and attitudes concerning the importance of education
2. strong sanctions to increase the probability of conformity to middle class achievement norms and values
3. role models with high levels of educational achievement to emulate
4. educational resources or materials to enhance interest and development in education
5. the financial support necessary for achievement for students who do not fall under categories 1-4 above, i.e., those who have the ability and motivation.

Friends and other people with whom children of lower socio-economic status frequently interact are themselves deprived of the psychological, social and material resources listed above. Thus, their friends and schoolmates in lower-class schools or neighborhoods cannot, or do not, provide the resources that are lacking. Some researchers have reported that middle-class teachers and other school personnel (implying that they are, have been and always will be middle class) discriminate against lower-class children, not necessarily because they are lower class but because they do not exhibit middle-class traits in the classroom. (3, 4, 6) In spite of the presence of some or all of these provisions, some lower-class children and students do aspire to, and sometimes achieve relatively high levels of education or enter professional level occupations. An obvious explanation for the departure from expected levels of aspiration or performance is that these "deviants" reside in homes where parents themselves depart from expected patterns of value commitment and expression, patterns of sanctioning, and provisions of developmental educational resource materials. There is evidence to support this explanation. (7, 13) In addition, lower-class children are exposed through mass media and by personal contact to higher levels of living and higher educational aspirations of peers. The fact that some do not resign suggests that ideals die hard, or that idealistic notions are partially effective under certain interacting circumstances. Placing the major burden of explanation on family of origin does not negate the effect of friends and teachers on variation in educational and occupational aspirations, achievements and expectations.

The explanations for variation in students' aspirations, achievements and expectations have received weak to strong support in the literature. We do not intend to make an issue of the validity of these findings. Rather, we raise an additional question. What are some of the conditions under which low-family-income affects students' life chances? For example, are there differences between boys and girls, urban and rural residents, or differences dependent on the type of indicator or scale used to measure socio-economic status (S.E.S.), or family income (as one indicator of social class)?

The objective of this paper is to test the general proposition that low family income tends to depress students' aspirations, achievements and expectations. The proposition will be tested controlling for sex, residence and family income.

The indirect consequences of low income are probably highly related and difficult to separate because of the high degree of association between them. The following explanatory sketch specifies some of the dimensions of achievement, aspirations and expectations which combine and inter-

[2] The income category which was most congruent with families in this study was husband-wife families, head and earner, two children under 18 years of age. By our sampling criteria, a family had to have one child in high school and many had more than one in high school. In the more extensive study, 60% of the respondents indicated that they had brothers living in their house, 56.5% that they had sisters; 64.6% indicated that they had one to three brothers or sisters alive at the time of the study. Allowing for some mutual identification of the presence of a sibling, one could infer indirectly that families in this sample most closely approximated the census classification of family mentioned above.

act to produce resignation from the idealistic notion that everyone who wants to do so can "make it" in our society. Arrival at a state of resignation by lower class youth is probably a consequence of a growing awareness that their life chances are relatively restricted.

It is our contention that a state of resignation is reached after a series of self-evaluations occurs over a period of time, from kindergarten through high school. The cumulative result is a generalized self-appraisal index which influences a scaling down of aspirations and expectations. We suggest that by the time a student reaches senior high school he has been partially sensitized to his appropriate position in the social structure. The indices which would enter into a fully satisfactory self-appraisal index are undefined in total, but in our study there are several which appear as logical candidates since the literature indicates they vary directly with income.

These indicators are:

1. grades received in school
2. type of course work in which the student is enrolled
3. assessment of ability by teachers
4. degree of acceptance in school by peers
5. perception of parents' ability to provide financial assistance for higher education, entrepreneurship, or entrance into professional or managerial occupations.

If students receive low grades, enroll in vocational or non-college preparatory curricula, are not encouraged by teachers, are not accepted by peers, and finally even if they score high on some of the self-appraisal indices, but see no possibility of financial support in educational or occupational pursuits, we would expect several outcomes. First, their conceptions of self would be affected, we assume negatively. Second, their educational and occupational aspirations, achievements and expectations would be affected, we assume downward. Third, the total picture would be one of resignation to low levels of education, low occupational achievement and their concomitants. The whole process would culminate in the students' awareness that they were destined to lower-class citizenship in our society, i.e., by our definition, resignation. Hence, when they were asked to decide on future educational and occupational goals, they would decide according to the cumulative and collective definition of their appropriate position in the educational and occupational hierarchy. This simplified explanatory sketch of the process of resignation needs further amplification to specify some of the conditions under which this line of reasoning holds.

One question which tends to be ignored is the extent to which individuals, particularly young people, are aware of the degree to which they are economically deprived. (7) We assume that there are enough clues and cues (e.g., style of living indices in the form of clothing, housing, and recreation) to penetrate most perceptual barriers that individuals may develop about actual income and its relationship to their relative worth. But are there sociological categories which preclude or restrict the scope or intensity (or both) of invidious comparisons of self with others with whom interaction takes place? Since differences have been reported in educational aspirations, school performance and occupational choices or pursuits by sex, we would hypothesize that being a member of a low income family might have differential effects depending on one's sex. (5, 12) Another sociological variable which might contribute to differential effects of poverty on students' aspirations and expectations is residence. The literature provides many illustrations of variation in personality, motivation, attitudes toward education and performance because of residence of students. (8) Consequently, sex and residence should be introduced into our explanatory sketch as control variables.

Another question which has seldom been raised, at least directly, concerns the extent of correspondence between different measures of relative family income. If there is a lack of correspondence between students' perception of family income and parents' report of actual dollar income, would the lack of correspondence contribute to unexpected variations in levels of aspiration and expectation by level of income? Differences in degree of correspondence could of course vary by sex and residence of the respondent, further complicating the relationship between level of income and measures of aspiration or expectation. To illustrate, a student may not be aware of the fact that his parents' level of income differs substantially from that of other parents. Therefore, his conception of self may not be affected negatively, a condition which might inhibit, or in some cases even prevent, resignation. Thus, we would hypothesize that those low income students who are most apt to be aware of status differences should exhibit the greatest scaling down of aspirations and expectations, or levels of achievement.

The literature on the subject would lead us to hypothesize that low income would have a constant effect regardless of the particular indices of family income utilized, or the sex and residence of the student, i.e., income would be directly related to educational and occupational aspirations, achievements, and expectations. However, we would expect that there would be differences in the magnitude and, possibly, direction of the relationship when sex and residence of students or indicants of family income are controlled.

Since there have been few theoretical formulations or empirical studies specifying patterns of variation by the control classifications mentioned above, we will report the findings from testing several hypotheses. The discussion will include an ad hoc explanation and interpretation of the findings when they suggest possibilities for filling in or modifying the explanatory sketch.

As stated above, the principal objective of this study is to test the general proposition that low family income adversely affects one's life chances because of its depressant effect on desire, perception of self and eventually performance. Since education is the most important mechanism for improving one's life chances relative to others, the two measures (indicators) of family income will be correlated with selected attributes of students that appear to be most promising for predicting levels of achievement in educational and occupational pursuits. These variables (attributes) can be grouped into five somewhat exclusive categories. They are:

A. school adjustment: preparation and interest
   1. school grades, i.e., A, B, C, D, or F, measured by students' reports of typical grades received in high school on their last report card
   2. type of course work taken (or anticipated), i.e., college preparatory curriculum or vocational pre-

paratory curriculum, measured by semesters of course work taken of each type
3. degree of interest in course work
4. discussion of educational and occupational plans with teachers, measured by a direct question on frequency of discussion
5. influence of teachers on college plans

B. acceptance in subculture of school
1. number of leadership positions held in high school
2. perception of whether students belonged to leading crowd

C. personal evaluation, measured with self concept scales
1. physical self
2. social self
3. academic self
4. emotional self

D. aspirations, expectations and military plans
1. educational aspirations
2. educational expectations
3. occupational aspirations
4. occupational expectations
5. military plans (boys only)

E. financial assistance in educational and occupational pursuits
1. perception of parents' willingness to finance students in possible educational and occupational pursuits.

The sample of students studied in this paper was from 30 Washington high schools in towns or cities of 10,000 population or less according to the 1960 census. The study was initiated in 1964. The data were obtained by questionnaires administered in classrooms to students, through interviews, and by mail for parents. The sample used in this study was composed of roughly proportionate numbers of farm and nonfarm students. The two residential classifications were matched on sex, grade in school, and self-reported grades in school. The number of students answering the personal evaluation questions is restricted because these questions were at the end of a long questionnaire. Of the students selected for interviewing, 95% were interviewed. Of the 972 parents sent questionnaires, 70% responded. Lowered response of parents reduced the possible number of comparisons of student perception of income and parents' report of their annual family income. Hence some bias may have been introduced into the study. The subsample of students and their respective parents included in this analysis included 601 parents and students. There were 290 boys and 311 girls. The ratio of nonfarm to farm students was two to one; there were 202 farm students and 399 nonfarm students. When sex, income, and residence of students in this sample was compared with sex, income, and residence of students in the more extensive study, the subsample was quite representative. (10) However, a comparison of income distribution of families in this subsample with all white, rural or rural-nonfarm families in the 1960 census indicated that this subsample was over-represented in the high income category, but under-represented in the low income category. (14) Income data from a 1964 nationwide sample of white farm and nonfarm families also indicated a probable under-representation of low income families. (16) There was a time lapse of 5 years between these two reports of family income. Therefore, some of the difference could have been accounted for by an average increase in family income, or it could simply be sampling or nonsampling error. It is also possible that some part of the difference may have been due to income differences between families with children in high school, presumably in the prime of life, and all Washington families, including the very old and the young. Two indicators of family wealth were utilized in this study. The first measure was obtained from students' perceptions of the relative amount of income and wealth of their family relative to other families in the community.[3] The second measure was obtained from parents of these same students. Parents were asked to report their actual dollar income.[4] In the findings and discussion section of the study these two measures will be referred to as S.R. (students' report of family income) and P.R. (parents' report of income). The degree of association between these two measures is reported in Table 1.

All hypotheses were tested using both measures of family income. We expected that the relationship would be strongest in the direction predicted when parents' report of income was compared with attributes discussed in the previous section, but variation by sex, residence, or both was anticipated.

FINDINGS

Hypothesis 1: *The lower the family income, the lower the number of semesters of college preparatory courses taken, anticipated, or both, in high school.*

Total semester hours of college preparatory courses was based on semesters of course work taken or anticipated, beyond state requirements, in algebra, biology, chemistry, foreign languages, physics, geometry and trigonometry.

The data reported in Tables 2 and 3 support this hypothesis. The direction of the relationship is positive, controlling for sex and residence independently, for both measures of family income. The only exception to this hypothesis was found for farm boys on the parents' report. The closest relationship was reported for all girls and nonfarm boys.

The negative results on the parents' report for farm boys can probably be explained by high income boys' plans to farm. For these boys, vocational courses would have as much

[3] Students were asked to indicate their family's relative standing on wealth and income on the following continuum:

In terms of income and wealth of families in my community, I think my family is:

a. considerably above average
b. above average
c. average
d. below average
e. considerably below average

[4] The question read as follows:

The 1964 income for my family from all sources was: (if you do not know exactly, make the best guess you can)

1. under $2,000
2. $ 2,000-$2,999
3. $ 3,000-$3,999
4. $4,000-$4,999
5. $ 5,000-$5,999
6. $ 6,000-$7,499
7. $7,500-$9,999
8. $10,000-$14,999
9. $15,000 & over

utility as college preparatory courses, or more. A previous analysis indicates that a similar explanation is plausible for those planning or expecting to attend graduate school as opposed to completing a bachelor's degree. (11)

Hypothesis 2: *The lower the family income, the higher the number of semesters of vocational courses taken, anticipated, or both, in high school.*

Total semester hours of vocational courses was based on semesters of shop, vocational agriculture, and business courses taken in high school for boys. For girls, the sum of vocational courses was based on business and home economics courses taken in high school.

There was support for this hypothesis in all control classifications except farm girls, for whom there was a low positive correlation. The strength of the relationship was greater for the parents' report than students' report, boys than girls, and nonfarm than farm students (Tables 4 and 5).

On the average, the degree of association was higher for college preparatory than vocational course work. This can be attributed to the relatively higher proportion of high income students in the "high" vocational course work category.

When the findings from testing hypotheses 1 and 2 are considered simultaneously, a marked tendency for "sponsoring" low income students into vocational courses and high income students into college preparatory courses is indicated, most strongly for nonfarm boys.

Hypothesis 3: *The lower the family income, the lower the reported grades received on report cards for last semester.*

Findings from previous studies indicated that school grades as reported by students would vary directly with in-

TABLE 1. Degree of association between students' perception of family income and wealth, and parents' report of dollar income, by sex of student

Students	Parents' Income Collapsed into Three Groups (Contingency Coefficient)	Parents' Income Uncollapsed, Nine Groupings (Contingency Coefficient)
Boys	.296	.474
Girls	.404	.488
All students	.345	.444

TABLE 2. Semesters of college preparatory course work[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Semesters College Preparatory Work	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	7	35	27	22	10	16	44	22	.170
High	2	10	16	13	12	20	30	15	
Nonfarm									
Low	13	35	74	30	18	16	105	26	.205
High	3	8	31	12	20	17	54	14	
Boys									
Low	11	50	42	24	16	17	69	24	.231
High	1	4	33	19	23	24	57	20	
Girls									
Low	9	26	59	30	12	15	80	26	.144
High	4	11	14	7	9	11	27	9	

[a] Low number of courses was *none*, and high was more than seven semesters.

TABLE 3. Semesters of college preparatory course work[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Semesters College Preparatory Work	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	8	31	29	23	13	26	50	25	.057
High	2	8	18	14	7	14	27	13	
Nonfarm									
Low	20	45	78	29	19	22	117	29	.292
High	1	2	31	11	19	22	51	13	
Boys									
Low	15	43	46	24	18	27	79	27	.170
High	2	6	37	20	16	24	55	19	
Girls									
Low	13	37	61	29	14	20	88	28	.362
High	1	3	12	6	10	14	23	7	

[a] Low number of courses was *none*, and high was more than seven semesters.

TABLE 4. Semesters of vocational course work[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Semesters Vocational Course Work	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	3	15	78	15	6	10	27	13	–.045
High	2	10	23	19	7	11	32	16	
Nonfarm									
Low	2	5	22	9	9	8	33	8	–.113
High	7	19	32	14	13	11	52	13	
Boys									
Low	2	9	16	9	7	7	25	9	–.190
High	5	23	48	28	17	18	70	24	
Girls									
Low	3	9	24	12	8	10	35	11	–.037
High	4	11	7	4	3	4	14	4	

[a] Low number of courses was *none*, and high was more than seven semesters.

TABLE 5. Semesters of vocational course work[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Semesters Vocational Course Work	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	3	11	30	24	10	20	43	21	–.116
High	6	23	14	11	8	16	28	14	
Nonfarm									
Low	7	16	45	17	16	18	68	17	–.130
High	10	23	26	10	10	11	46	11	
Boys									
Low	4	11	13	7	8	12	25	9	–.233
High	15	43	38	20	18	27	71	24	
Girls									
Low	6	17	62	30	18	26	86	28	–.039
High	1	3	2	1	0	0	3	1	

[a] Low number of courses was *none*, and high was more than seven semesters.

come. The data in Tables 6 and 7 lend consistent evidence to support the hypothesis. There is a positive correlation between grades and income regardless of sex and residence on the S.R. However, on the P.R., a negative correlation was found for farm students on the parents' report.

Since there was no trend toward consistent contradictory findings for farm students on income and its relationship to other variables, and this was not the case on the S.R., we can only assume that farm students are less "accurate" than nonfarm students in reporting grades, family income, or both. Data in Table 7 indicate that farm students in the high income category had a higher proportion of students reporting low grades than farm students in the low and average income categories. However, they also reported higher grades than farm students in other income categories.

Hypothesis 4: *The lower the family income, the lower the proportion of students who indicated that teachers had encouraged them to enroll in college.*

There is little support for this hypothesis. Previous research suggested that some bias might be present in the case of special treatment of upper- and middle-class students by middle-class teachers. (3, 6) In the student report, farm students and all girls in low income groups reported more encouragement (or as much encouragement) than students in average and high income groups. Data from Table 9 taken from the parents' report of income do not indicate a systematic bias by teachers, althought there is some support for all control classifications except farm students.

Some caution should be taken in interpretation of these data as reflecting a lack of teacher bias, or presence of teacher bias. First, the differences where present are relatively small. And, second, the data are the perceptions of students, and hence do not necessarily reflect the actual situation, i.e., what teachers actually do, or their more subtle attempts to "explain" to students that they should not make plans to enroll in college. The fact that only five students indicated that teachers had discouraged them from attending college reveals

TABLE 6. Self reported grades[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Grades	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
Low	3	15	28	23	12	20	46	23	.114
High	5	25	31	26	23	38	59	29	
Nonfarm									
Low	13	23	67	27	25	22	102	26	.149
High	4	11	68	28	38	33	110	28	
Boys									
Low	11	50	66	38	23	25	100	35	.173
High	8	37	48	33	46	49	112	39	
Girls									
Low	5	14	32	17	14	17	51	16	.199
High	5	14	65	34	38	46	108	35	

[a] Low grades were mostly C's, C's & D's, D's, D's & F's, i.e., C's or less. High grades were mostly A's, A's & B's, and B's, i.e., B's and above.

TABLE 7. Self reported grades[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Grades	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
Low	7	27	25	20	14	29	46	23	–.014
High	7	27	37	29	15	31	59	29	
Nonfarm									
Low	18	41	69	26	18	21	105	26	.267
High	2	4	76	28	32	37	110	28	
Boys									
Low	17	48	62	33	21	32	100	34	.126
High	8	23	79	42	25	38	112	39	
Girls									
Low	8	23	32	15	11	16	51	16	.213
High	5	14	71	34	32	46	108	35	

[a] Low grades were mostly C's, C's & D's, D's, D's & F's, i.e., C's or less. High grades were mostly A's, A's & B's, and B's, i.e., B's and above.

TABLE 8. Effect of teachers' encouragement on college attendance of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Encouragement of Teachers	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma[a]
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
No effect	8	44	62	55	27	50	97	53	
Encouraged	10	56	48	45	27	50	85	47	
Nonfarm									
No effect	21	62	136	59	61	59	218	59	
Encouraged	13	38	95	41	43	41	151	41	
Boys									
No effect	11	58	87	55	46	56	144	56	
Encouraged	8	42	71	45	36	44	115	44	
Girls									
No effect	18	55	111	60	42	55	151	59	
Encouraged	15	45	72	40	34	45	121	41	

[a] Since there were only two data points, gamma was not computed.

TABLE 9. Effect of teachers' encouragement on college attendance of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Encouragement of Teachers	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma[a]
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
No effect	13	52	62	54	22	48	97	53	
Encouraged	12	48	53	46	20	52	85	47	
Nonfarm									
No effect	27	69	142	57	49	60	218	59	
Encouraged	12	31	107	43	33	40	152	41	
Boys									
No effect	19	59	91	54	34	57	144	55	
Encouraged	13	41	77	46	26	43	116	45	
Girls									
No effect	21	66	113	58	37	58	171	59	
Encouraged	11	34	83	42	27	42	121	41	

[a] Since there were only two data points, gamma was not computed. Discouraged from attending college was not used since there were only five cases, all from the average income category on both reports.

the saliency with which higher education for all is valued in our society.

Hypothesis 5: *The lower the family income, the less the discussion of educational and occupational plans with teachers.*

TABLE 10. Amount of discussion of educational and occupational plans[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls with teachers, by family income (S.R.)

Amount of Discussion of Plans	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
Low	7	37	49	41	33	54	89	44	–.223
High	1	5	8	7	2	3	11	5	
Nonfarm									
Low	14	38	125	51	52	46	191	48	–.025
High	3	8	10	4	3	3	16	4	
Boys									
Low	6	29	81	47	44	47	131	46	–.153
High	0	0	11	6	3	3	14	5	
Girls									
Low	15	43	93	48	41	50	149	50	–.096
High	4	11	7	4	2	2	13	4	

[a] Low discussion equals none. High discussion equals "very much" discussion.

TABLE 11. Amount of discussion of educational and occupational plans[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls with teachers by family income (P.R.)

Amount of Discussion of Plans	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
Low	9	36	59	47	21	43	89	44	–.066
High	2	8	8	6	1	2	11	5	
Nonfarm									
Low	25	57	121	45	45	52	191	48	–.030
High	3	7	12	4	1	1	16	4	
Boys									
Low	16	52	85	45	31	46	131	45	–.028
High	2	6	10	5	2	3	14	5	
Girls									
Low	18	53	96	46	35	51	149	48	–.057
High	3	9	10	5	0	0	13	4	

[a] See footnote, Table 10.

Much to our surprise, there was little or no support for this hypothesis. The direction of relationship as reported in Tables 10, 11 and 12 was negative, except for nonfarm boys, .003, S.R. and .023 P.R.

One of the factors which may have affected this relationship was that class standing in high school was not controlled. Senior students discussed their plans more frequently with teachers in this sample of students. Hence, if we had controlled for class standing, different results might have occurred. Another plausible explanation for the negative relationship for boys is that high income farm boys planning to farm might not feel a need to discuss their plans with teachers. The data, when sex and residence are controlled simultaneously, lend only indirect and weak support to this line of reasoning. An examination of Table 12 reveals that high income farm boys have the highest proportion in the "no discussion of plans with teachers," whereas for nonfarm boys in the P.R., the reverse holds. The strength of the relationship was greater in the S.R. than in the P.R.

Hypothesis 6: *The lower the family income, the lower the interest in school course work.*

Data from Tables 13 and 14 suggest there is support for this hypothesis on all control classifications in the S.R., and for farm and nonfarm boys on the P.R.

TABLE 12. Amount of discussion of educational and occupational plans[a] of farm and nonfarm boys with teachers by family income (S.R.) and (P.R.)

Amount of Discussion of Plans	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm Boys									
P.R. Low	6	43	26	46	12	52	44	47	–.113
S.R. Low	3	38	23	40	18	62	44	47	–.282
Nonfarm Boys									
P.R. Low	10	48	58	45	19	43	87	45	.023
S.R. Low	3	23	58	50	26	41	87	45	.003

[a] "Low" discussion students were those who checked the "not at all" blank on the question, "To what extent have you discussed your plans with one or more teachers."

TABLE 13. Amount of interest in school course work[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Interest in School Work	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
Low	7	35	30	25	15	25	52	26	.109
High	2	10	15	12	10	16	27	13	
Nonfarm									
Low	10	27	73	29	24	21	107	27	.136
High	5	13	29	12	19	16	53	13	
Boys									
Low	12	54	64	37	26	28	102	35	.210
High	1	4	22	13	12	13	35	12	
Girls									
Low	5	14	39	20	13	16	57	18	.092
High	6	17	22	11	17	21	45	14	

[a] Low equals interest in little or none. High equals interest in all or most course work.

TABLE 14. Amount of interest in school course work[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Interest in School Work	Low Income		Average Income		High Income		Total		Gamma
	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	
Farm									
Low	9	36	33	26	10	20	52	26	.079
High	4	16	18	14	5	10	27	13	
Nonfarm									
Low	12	27	79	29	17	19	108	27	.156
High	4	9	34	13	15	17	53	13	
Boys									
Low	17	50	71	38	15	22	103	35	.297
High	2	6	22	12	11	16	35	12	
Girls									
Low	4	11	41	20	12	17	57	18	–.065
High	6	17	30	14	9	13	45	14	

[a] See footnote, Table 13.

The only exception to the support for this hypothesis was reported for girls as noted in Table 14. It is quite possible that girls from high income families do not see the utility of course work for their future plans, but that boys see that vocational courses develop work skills that may lead to good jobs or that college preparatory courses are essential to fulfill college plans or aspirations. Hence, if occupational aspirations or plans were controlled for girls, family income might be related to interest in course work in the direction predicted in the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 7: *The lower the family income, the lower the number of leadership positions that students will indicate they occupy in school.*

There is consistent support for this hypothesis in both family-income reports, especially in the low category of leadership, i.e., no leadership positions. Boys and farm students appear to be most affected by low income. However, the magnitude of the gammas reported in Tables 15 and 16 indicates that a positive, but weak, relationship exists between family income and number of leadership positions. The strongest support for this hypothesis was evident for boys, especially farm boys. Data in Tables 15 and 16 suggest that many students regardless of sex or residence do not hold leadership positions in their respective schools. Whether somewhat equal representation is due to deliberate attempts to maintain democratic appearances, or to voting and selection patterns being associated with socio-economic position of students, cannot be ascertained from the data.

A plausible reason for the low positive relationship is the contextual situation in which this study was carried out, i.e., relatively small rural high schools. Small schools provide opportunity for a greater proportion of students to participate in activities, thus increasing the probability of exposure of students from all class or income groupings. Finally, the self-reports used may not be congruent with occupying a leadership position, or the concept "leadership position" may have been unclear.

Hypothesis 8: *The lower the family income, the lower the proportion of students who will indicate that they are members of the "leading crowd."*

Findings from James S. Coleman's study and others of a high school would lead us to predict that low family income would decrease the probability of being accepted in the "dominant" or popular groups within the high school. (2) The data lend relatively strong support to this hypothesis in the case of nonfarm students, and to a lesser extent in the case of boys. Data in Tables 17 and 18 indicate there is support for the hypothesized relationships for all control classifications.

TABLE 15. Leadership positions in school[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Number Leadership Positions	Low Income (#)	Low Income (%)	Average Income (#)	Average Income (%)	High Income (#)	High Income (%)	Total (#)	Total (%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	9	64	54	48	21	36	84	44	.071
High	4	20	16	14	7	12	27	14	
Nonfarm									
Low	21	60	106	46	56	49	183	48	.052
High	4	11	28	12	12	10	44	12	
Boys									
Low	14	67	73	46	40	42	127	46	.115
High	3	14	25	16	12	13	40	14	
Girls									
Low	16	47	87	47	37	47	140	47	.015
High	5	15	19	10	7	9	31	10	

[a] Low equals "none." High equals more than five leadership positions.

TABLE 16. Leadership positions in school[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Number Leadership Positions	Low Income (#)	Low Income (%)	Average Income (#)	Average Income (%)	High Income (#)	High Income (%)	Total (#)	Total (%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	13	54	56	46	15	33	84	44	.109
High	6	25	24	20	10	21	40	21	
Nonfarm									
Low	19	49	125	49	39	45	183	48	.024
High	9	23	44	17	20	23	73	21	
Boys									
Low	16	52	85	47	26	40	127	46	.111
High	7	23	30	17	15	23	52	19	
Girls									
Low	16	50	96	49	28	41	140	47	.047
High	8	25	38	19	15	22	61	20	

[a] Low equals "none." High equals more than five leadership positions.

TABLE 17. Proportion[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls belonging to "leading crowd" in their high school by family income (S.R.)

Belonging to Leading Crowd	Low Income (#)	Low Income (%)	Average Income (#)	Average Income (%)	High Income (#)	High Income (%)	Total (#)	Total (%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	9	64	59	63	21	60	89	63	
High	5	36	34	37	14	40	53	37	
Nonfarm									
Low	23	77	125	69	52	60	200	67	
High	7	23	56	31	35	40	98	33	
Boys									
Low	13	69	84	65	38	53	135	62	
High	4	31	34	35	33	47	82	38	
Girls									
Low	19	70	100	69	35	69	154	69	
High	8	30	45	31	16	31	69	31	

[a] Low equals not belonging, and high equals belonging to the leading crowd.

TABLE 18. Proportion[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls belonging to "leading crowd" in their high schools by family income (P.R.)

Belonging to Leading Crowd	Low Income (#)	Low Income (%)	Average Income (#)	Average Income (%)	High Income (#)	High Income (%)	Total (#)	Total (%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	14	67	57	64	18	56	89	63	
High	7	33	32	36	14	44	53	37	
Nonfarm									
Low	24	83	140	69	37	56	201	67	
High	5	17	64	31	29	44	98	33	
Boys									
Low	20	80	88	63	28	53	136	62	
High	5	20	52	37	25	47	82	38	
Girls									
Low	18	72	109	71	27	60	154	69	
High	7	28	44	29	18	40	69	31	

However, girls on the student report are practically undifferentiated on not belonging to the leading crowd, but on the parents' report girls in the low income families tend to have a lower proportion in the leading crowd. The lack of support for this hypothesis when controlling for sex can be accounted for by examining the data in Table 19, where sex and residence are controlled simultaneously. Data for not belonging are presented.

The hypothesis does receive support for nonfarm girls on both reports, but not for farm girls. This was not the case when similar comparisons were made for farm and nonfarm boys. Hence, we would conclude that there is support for this hypothesis with the exception of farm girls. Nonfarm students in the low income category tend to report the lowest proportion of acceptance or "membership" in the leading crowd. Assuming our sample is representative, what reasons can be given for the differences in belonging or not belonging to the leading crowd, by sex and residence? One possible reason is that reporting of farm family income is less accurate than nonfarm family reporting. The strength of the relationship between family income and variables affecting one's life chances tends to be closer for nonfarm than farm students. However, to infer that the reporting is less accurate is quite risky without some check on external validity of the income measure, especially when the strength of the relationship is greater for nonfarm than farm students on the student report. There is some variation in income by sex and residence reported in Table 20 in both student and parent reports of income.

Differences by sex on the parents' report, and by residence on the students' report are negligible. The arbitrary breaks for income groups "cause" underestimation of low income on the S.R., which may account for the fact that relationships were stronger for the comparison of parental report of income and variables affecting one's life chances than they were for student report.

Hypothesis 9: The lower the income, the lower the evaluation of oneself on measures of physical, social, academic and emotional self.

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between family income and other indicators of one's relative worth as a student, contributing to, or reinforcing one's conception of different dimensions of self (physical, social, academic and emotional). Four measures or dimensions of self were used in this study. The semantic differential technique was used with four concepts and selected bipolar adjectives.[5]

The findings reported in Table 21 support the hypothesis on the parents' and students' reports for physical self, social self, and emotional self and for boys, girls, and nonfarm students on the academic self measure. Thus, the only exception was farm students on the parents' report for the academic self measure. However, when the responses to the bipolar set of adjectives in the academic self scale were subjected to Guttman scaling procedure (C.R. .95) and this final set of items was correlated with family income measures there were no exceptions.[6] On the average, the size of the correlation

TABLE 19. Proportion of farm and nonfarm girls not belonging to leading crowd in high school by family income (S.R. and P.R.)

	Family Income—S.R.				Family Income—P.R.			
	Low	Avg.	High		Low	Avg.	High	
Residence	(%)	(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)	
Farm Girls	62	67	67	(N= 49)	60	72	50	(N= 49)
Nonfarm Girls	74	70	69	(N=105)	80	71	64	(N=105)

TABLE 20. Percentage distribution of farm and nonfarm boys and girls on family income, by student and parent report of income.

Residence and Sex	Family Income—S.R.			Family Income—P.R.			
	Low (%)	Avg. (%)	High (%)	Low (%)	Avg. (%)	High (%)	TOTAL (#)
Residence							
Farm	10.1	59.8	30.1	12.4	63.8	23.8	199
Nonfarm	9.2	61.8	29.0	10.6	67.5	22.0	393
Sex							
Boys	7.3	59.9	32.9	11.2	65.5	23.4	304
Girls	11.3	61.8	26.9	11.6	66.5	21.9	319

TABLE 21. Degree of association between family income (S.R. and P.R.) and students' evaluation of their physical, social, academic and emotional self, by residence and sex

	S.R. (Gamma)		P.R. (Gamma)	
RESIDENCE				
Farm				
Physical	.065		.006	
Social	.084		.063	
Academic	−.068	(.137)[a]	−.031	(.088)
Emotional	.090		.171	
Nonfarm				
Physical	.144		.070	
Social	.129		.048	
Academic	.055	(.228)	.214	(.145)
Emotional	.046		.031	
SEX				
Boys				
Physical	.059		.118	
Social	.019		.225	
Academic	.027	(.129)	.214	(.329)
Emotional	.121		.178	
Girls				
Physical	.138		.003	
Social	.069		.079	
Academic	.116	(.205)	.015	(.111)
Emotional	.113		.092	

[a] Gammas in parentheses indicate degree of association between academic self evaluation and family income when the 6-item Guttman scale was used.

[5] The number of students in this analysis differs from the number in all other hypotheses because questions on self evaluation were not used in all high schools.

[6] Six items from the original set of 12 were retained for the academic-self scale.

(magnitude of the gamma) was increased when Guttman scale of academic self was used, in place of a simple sum of scores on the twelve bipolar adjectives.

Hypothesis 10: *The lower the family income, the lower the educational aspirations of students.*

There was uniform support for this hypothesis, for all control classifications. Data in Tables 22 and 23 indicate the closest relationship was reported for boys, .151 in S.R. and nonfarm students, .411 in P.R. The strength of the relationship was greater for the P.R. than on the S.R. as predicted for all control classifications except farm boys where the relationship was in the same direction but very slightly less in magnitude, .055 – S.R., and .051 – P.R. Variation in income obviously has the greatest effect on educational aspirations of boys.

Hypothesis 11: *The lower the family income, the lower the educational expectations.*

As with educational aspirations, there was support for this hypothesis on all control classifications. The greatest support was found for nonfarm students, both boys and girls. The strength of the relationship tended to be greater on the parents' report, i.e., the magnitude of the gamma was higher on the P.R. than on the student report. Data on the relationship between family income and educational expectations are reported in Tables 24 and 25.

Hypothesis 12: *The lower the family income, the lower the occupational aspirations.*

There was support for this hypothesis on all control classifications. The magnitude of the association as reported in Tables 26 and 27 was greater on P.R. than on S.R.

Hypothesis 13: *The lower the family income, the lower the occupational expectations.*

Data in Tables 28 and 29 reveal support for this hypothesis on all control classifications. The magnitude of association between income and the occupational prestige of the occupation that high school students expected to be in was, in every case, higher on P.R. than on S.R. The hypothesis received stronger support for boys than for girls, and for nonfarm rather than farm students.

Hypothesis 14: *The lower the income, the greater the proportion of male students who will indicate that they will enlist now or after high school or wait to be drafted, or conversely, the lower the proportion who will plan on earning a commission in the service through college programs.*

TABLE 22. Educational aspirations of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Educational Aspirations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	4	20	8	7	2	3	14	7	.061
High	13	65	64	54	35	58	112	56	
Nonfarm									
Low	6	17	14	6	9	8	29	7	.120
High	17	47	122	50	67	59	206	52	
Boys									
Low	6	29	6	3	5	5	17	6	.151
High	11	52	103	61	62	66	176	62	
Girls									
Low	4	11	16	8	6	7	26	8	.019
High	19	54	83	43	40	50	142	46	

TABLE 23. Educational aspirations of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Educational Aspirations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	7	27	4	3	3	6	14	7	.188
High	10	38	76	61	26	54	112	56	
Nonfarm									
Low	13	32	33	13	5	6	51	13	.411
High	5	12	95	37	45	54	145	38	
Boys									
Low	6	18	8	4	3	4	17	6	.344
High	13	39	115	62	48	72	176	62	
Girls									
Low	10	29	12	6	4	6	26	8	.267
High	9	26	96	47	37	54	142	46	

TABLE 24. Educational expectations[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Educational Expectations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	3	16	13	11	5	9	21	11	.154
High	6	32	43	35	25	43	74	38	
Nonfarm									
Low	8	23	33	14	10	9	51	14	.208
High	8	23	85	37	52	47	145	38	
Boys									
Low	7	35	21	13	11	12	39	14	.196
High	8	40	67	41	47	52	122	45	
Girls									
Low	4	12	25	13	4	5	33	11	.159
High	6	18	61	33	30	38	97	33	

[a] Low educational expectations were high school graduation or less. High expectations were graduation from 4-year college or more.

TABLE 25. Educational expectations[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Educational Expectations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	5	21	14	11	2	4	21	11	.188
High	7	29	48	39	19	41	74	38	
Nonfarm									
Low	13	32	33	13	5	6	51	13	.411
High	5	12	95	37	45	54	145	38	
Boys									
Low	9	30	26	14	4	6	39	14	.372
High	5	17	83	46	34	54	122	44	
Girls									
Low	9	26	21	11	3	4	33	11	.267
High	7	21	60	30	30	45	97	33	

[a] See footnote, Table 24.

The data in Table 30 provide support for this hypothesis for nonfarm boys but not for farm boys. It should be noted that this study was completed before a majority of young men had to give serious consideration to draft calls, i.e., the draft quotas were relatively low. As we would expect, early enlistment rates among high school students decline with rising income, and plans for officer training as a goal increase with rising income. These figures tend to be congruent with reports on actual enlistment and draft figures by income of enlistee or draftee. Again, these figures may be misleading since the number of respondents in the low income category when controlling for sex and residence simultaneously was relatively small (9 and 13 farm and nonfarm on S.R., and 13 farm and 17 nonfarm on P.R.).

The lack of support in the case of male farm students may reflect less knowledge of training or job opportunities in the military service.

TABLE 26. Occupational aspirations of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Occupational Aspirations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	14	52	78	38	31	34	123	38	.016
High	13	48	126	62	62	66	201	62	
Nonfarm									
Low	7	41	25	26	15	30	47	29	.142
High	10	59	72	74	35	70	117	71	
Boys									
Low	3	25	30	22	8	11	41	18	.241
High	9	75	109	78	63	89	181	82	
Girls									
Low	16	55	69	44	33	50	118	47	.007
High	13	45	86	56	33	50	132	53	

TABLE 27. Occupational aspirations of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (P.R.)

Occupational Aspirations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	10	43	26	26	11	27	47	29	.091
High	13	57	74	74	30	73	119	71	
Nonfarm									
Low	24	69	81	37	19	27	124	38	.327
High	11	31	139	63	51	73	201	62	
Boys									
Low	14	48	25	18	3	6	42	19	.406
High	15	52	117	83	49	94	181	81	
Girls									
Low	16	54	39	45	26	46	118	47	.135
High	9	36	92	55	31	54	132	53	

TABLE 28. Occupational expectations[a] of farm and nonfarm boys and girls by family income (S.R.)

Occupational Expectations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	8	57	31	38	16	42	55	41	.106
High	6	43	51	62	22	58	79	59	
Nonfarm									
Low	9	64	81	54	29	39	119	51	.181
High	5	36	68	46	45	61	118	49	
Boys									
Low	6	54	43	40	16	29	65	37	.239
High	5	46	65	60	40	71	110	63	
Girls									
Low	11	65	69	56	29	55	109	56	.074
High	6	35	54	44	27	45	87	44	

[a] Low occupational expectation equals occupations less than managerial and professional. High equals owner, manager and professional.

TABLE 29. Occupational expectations[a] of high school students by family income (P.R.)

Occupational Expectations	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)	Gamma
Farm									
Low	11	58	33	39	11	37	55	41	.237
High	8	42	52	61	19	63	79	59	
Nonfarm									
Low	20	77	77	49	33	38	120	50	.249
High	6	23	79	51	56	62	118	50	
Boys									
Low	17	65	40	36	9	24	66	37	.372
High	9	35	72	64	29	76	110	63	
Girls									
Low	14	74	70	54	27	52	111	56	.156
High	5	26	59	46	23	48	87	44	

[a] See footnote in Table 28.

TABLE 30. Military plans of farm and nonfarm boys by family income (S.R. and P.R.)

	Low Income (#)	(%)	Average Income (#)	(%)	High Income (#)	(%)	Total (#)	(%)
STUDENT REPORT								
Farm Boys								
Enlist now or after H.S.	0	0	7	14	5	17	12	13
Wait until drafted	4	44	18	35	6	21	28	31
Commission in college	2	22	16	31	9	31	27	30
Nonfarm Boys								
Enlist now or after H.S.	4	31	20	19	5	8	29	16
Wait until drafted	6	46	20	19	10	17	36	20
Commission in college	1	8	44	41	32	53	77	43
PARENT REPORT								
Farm Boys								
Enlist now or after H.S.	1	8	11	20	0	0	12	13
Wait until drafted	5	38	13	24	10	45	28	31
Commission in college	2	15	9	17	2	9	13	15
Nonfarm Boys								
Enlist now or after H.S.	7	41	19	16	3	7	29	16
Wait until drafted	5	29	25	21	6	14	36	20
Commission in college	1	6	22	18	10	24	33	18

Hypothesis 15: *The lower the income, the higher the proportion of students who will indicate that their parents will not be able to support them in any educational or occupational pursuits.*

The evidence supporting this hypothesis is overwhelming, especially when low income boys and girls are compared with average and high income students. Of course, this is not new information and we would have been very surprised had our results been different, since many educational and occupational pursuits require financial assistance beyond the resources of parents with low income. Data in Table 31 indicate strongest support for this hypothesis when low income students regardless of sex and residence are compared with average and high income students. The findings indicate that students' perception of their family willingness to support them in "none" of several educational and occupational pursuits varies directly with level of family income.

TABLE 31. Proportion of farm and nonfarm boys and girls indicating that their parents would not be willing to help them finance any[a] educational and occupational objectives

	S.R.				P.R.			
	Low	Average	High	All	Low	Average	High	All
Farm Boys	22.2	3.5	7.1	6.4	15.4	5.2	4.3	6.4
Nonfarm Boys	25.0	12.8	1.5	9.8	40.0	6.1	6.8	9.7
Boys	23.8	9.8	3.2	8.7	30.3	5.8	6.0	8.6
Farm Girls	18.2	8.1	3.1	7.6	25.0	6.0	3.8	7.6
Nonfarm Girls	29.2	7.8	6.0	9.9	17.4	8.8	9.3	9.9
Girls	25.7	7.8	4.9	9.1	20.0	7.8	7.2	9.1
Farm Students	20.0	5.9	5.0	7.0	20.0	5.6	4.1	7.0
Nonfarm Students	27.8	10.2	3.5	9.8	27.9	7.5	8.0	9.8

[a] The list of educational and occupational objectives included: farming, college, vocational schooling, setting up business of my own, and *none of the above*. The italicized alternative is the basis for the distribution in this table.

REFERENCES

1. Coleman, James S. et al. 1966. Equality of educational opportunity. U.S. Office of Education.
2. Coleman, James S. 1961. The adolescent society. The Free Press of Glencoe.
3. Davis, Allison. 1949. Social class influences on learning. Harvard University Press.
4. Davis, Allison and John Dollard. 1940. Children of bondage. American Council on Education. Washington, D.C.
5. Flanagan, John C. et al. 1964. The American high school student. Tech. Report to the U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Res. Proj. 635. Project Talent Office, Univ. of Pittsburgh.
6. Hollingshead, August B. 1949. Elmstown's Youth. John Wiley and Sons.
7. Horner, James T., James G. Buterbaugh and J. Judith Carefoot. 1967. Research summary: factors relating to occupational and educational decision making of rural youth. Univ. of Nebraska, Department of Agricultural Education Report 1, esp. pp. 4-16.
8. Ohlendorf, George W. and William P. Kuvlesky. 1966. A bibliography of literature on status aspirations and expectations: educational, residence, income, and family orientations. Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, Dept. Inf. Rept. 66-7. Texas A&M Univ.
9. Rushing, William A. 1968. Aspects of deprivation in a rural poverty class. Rural Sociology. 33:269-284.
10. Sexton, Patricia Cayo. 1961. Education and income. The Viking Press.
11. Slocum, Walter L. 1967. Educational aspirations and expectations of students in rural Washington high schools. Wash. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 690.
12. Slocum, Walter L. and LaMar T. Empey. 1956. Occupational planning by young women. Wash. Agri. Exp. Sta. Bull. 568.
13. Wallin, Paul and Leslie C. Waldo. Social class background of 8th grade pupils, social class composition of their schools, their academic aspirations and school adjustment. Sociology Dept., Stanford Univ. Cooperative Research Project 1935.
14. U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1963. U.S. census of population: 1960. Vol. I, characteristics of the population, part 49, Washington, Table 65, pp. 49-117.
15. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Pocket data book, USA 1967, p. 189.
16. U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1965. Current population reports, series P-60, No. 47. Income in 1964 of families and persons in the United States.